



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/889,372	08/10/2001	Jun Nakagawa	110106	2666

25944 7590 03/22/2007  
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC  
P.O. BOX 19928  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER
----------

PAPPAS, PETER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2628

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/22/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/889,372	NAKAGAWA, JUN	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Peter-Anthony Pappas	2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,10-12,20-22 and 27-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,10-12,20-22 and 27-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities: said claim should read "The computer readable medium as defined in claim 11..." Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 21, 22 and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. While abstract ideas, natural phenomena and laws of nature are not eligible for patenting, methods and products employing abstract ideas, natural phenomena, and laws of nature to perform a real-world function may well be. For claims including such excluded subject matter to be eligible, the claim must be for a practical application of the abstract idea, law of nature, or natural phenomenon. *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 187, 209 USPQ at 8 ("application of a law of nature or mathematical formula to a known structure or process may well be deserving of patent protection."); *Benson*, 409 U.S. at 71, 175 USPQ at 676 (rejecting formula claim because it "has no substantial practical application"). To satisfy section 101 requirements, the claim must be for a practical application of the § 101 judicial exception, which can be identified in various ways: the claimed invention "transforms" an article or physical object to a different state or thing; the claimed invention otherwise produces a useful, concrete and tangible result.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 10-12, 20-22 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley et al. (Computer Graphics: Principles and Practice) in view of Deering (Pub. No. US 2003/0011618 A1) and further in view of Griffin (U.S. Patent No. 5,990,904).

5. In regard to claim 1 Foley et al. teaches a high-level conceptual framework which can be used to describe almost any interactive graphics system (p. 17, §1.6.1; Fig. 1.5). Foley et al. teaches that a raster display system, with a peripheral display processor, is a common architecture that avoids the disadvantages of the simpler raster display by introducing a separate graphic processor to perform graphics functions. Said system includes a CPU, system memory, a display processor and display processor memory, all of which are interconnected via a system bus (p. 170, § 4.3.2; Fig. 4.22). It is noted said system memory is considered to store a program and data for image generation and said display processor is considered to perform the processing for image generating.

Foley et al. teaches that at times one might want the view volume to be finite, in order to limit the number of output primitives projected on the view plane. This can be

Art Unit: 2628

accomplished through the use of a front clipping plane and a back clipping plane (p. 240, ¶ 2).

Foley et al. teaches that depth cueing, seen as a simplified version of the effects of atmospheric attenuation, exploits the fact that distant objects (objects intended to appear farther from a viewer) appear dimmer than closer object. In depth cueing interpolation occurs between the color of a given primitive (color of a given object as represented by its primitive) and a user-specified depth-cue (target) color (p. 610-611, §14.3.4; p. 727-728, §16.1.3; p. 1044-1046, §20.8.2). Foley et al. illustrates a depth cueing area in Color Plate II.24 and Color Plate II.25. It is noted that the respective claim language includes open-ended language (i.e. comprising). Thus, said claim is not considered read on the depth cueing area being set only near the backward clipping plane. It is implicitly taught by Foley et al. that said depth cueing area depends, at least to some degree, on a viewpoint as said scenes in Color Plate II.24 and Color Plate II.25 contain various graphical information displayed from a given viewpoint. In addition it is noted that said Color Plates are considered to comprise objects in both the background and foreground.

Foley et al. fails to explicitly teach varying an alpha value of the object so that the object being more distant from the viewpoint becomes more transparent. Deering teaches that simple fogging is a special case of alpha blending, in which the degree of alpha changes with distance (depth) so that the object appears to vanish into a haze (alpha varies), as the object moves away from the viewer. This simple fogging may also be referred to as depth cueing or atmospheric attenuation (p. 1, ¶ 11).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time of the applicant's invention, to combine the teachings of Foley et al. and Deering in regard to the details of depth cueing and atmospheric attenuation (i.e. haze), because Deering teaches how atmospheric attenuation can be achieved in regard to varying an alpha value and thus serves to further clarify the application of atmosphere attenuation to a given area when utilized in a given graphic systems.

Foley et al. and Deering fail to explicitly teach sorting objects of which alpha values are varied so that the objects are drawn in succession starting from an object nearest to the viewpoint and performing hidden-surface erasing based on a Z-buffer process for the objects of which alpha values are varied. Griffin teaches an improved method and a hardware system for merging pixel fragments, allowing for a reduction of memory usage in a given graphics rendering system (col. 4, lines 66-67; Abstract). Griffin teaches that said system utilizes Z-buffering, which has the advantages of computational speed and simplicity (col. 9, lines 55-57; col. 3, lines 48-49). Griffin further teaches that color and alpha are accumulated using a front to back approach and that for hardware implementations front to back is preferable because the resolve process is less hardware intensive (col. 42, lines 10-67; col. 43, lines 1-46). Griffin further teaches that said system supports a wide range of interactive applications. Its ability to support advanced real time animation makes it well-suited for games, educational applications, and a host of interactive applications (col. 7, lines 1-5).

Foley et al. and Deering fail to explicitly teach varying a depth cueing value for each vertex of the object based on a Z-value for each vertex of the object and varying

Art Unit: 2628

the alpha value for each vertex of the object based on the Z-value for each vertex of the object. Griffin teaches that the method begins by queuing primitives in the set-up block 383. The vertex input processor 384 parses the input data stream and queues triangle data in the vertex control registers 387 (961, 962). The scan convert block 397 reads the geometric primitives queued in the set-up block. The scan convert block 397 performs pixel generation operations as soon as requested texture data is available in the texture cache 402. The pixel engine 406 performs pixel level calculations including hidden surface removal and blending operations. To perform hidden surface removal, the pixel engine 406 compares depth values for incoming pixels (fully covered pixels or pixel fragments) with pixels at corresponding locations in the pixel or fragment buffers. After performing the pixel level calculations, the pixel engine stores the appropriate data in the pixel or fragment buffers (col. 32, lines 55-67; col. 33, lines 1-37). As illustrated in Fig. 9A-9B said pixel information is generated from said vertex information and thus said pixel information is considered to represent said vertex information.

Griffin further teaches that the merge test blocks 1000-1008 compare the depth, color and alpha components for new and previous pixel fragments, and if the new and previous values are within a predetermined tolerance, they output a bit indicating that the new pixel fragment is a merge candidate. The pixel engine then performs a bitwise AND (1010) to determine whether each of the merge tests has passed. If so, the pixel engine merges the new and previous pixel fragments. The pixel engine can attempt to merge an incoming pixel fragment only with the pixel fragment closest to the viewpoint (with lowest z value) or can attempt to merge with several pixel fragments stored for a

Art Unit: 2628

pixel location (col. 37, lines 48-67; col. 38, lines 1-20). It is noted that the merging or insertion of fragments would result in the modification or creation, respectively, of depth and alpha values.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time of the applicant's invention, to incorporate the teachings of Griffin into the system taught by both Foley et al. and Deering, because through such an incorporation the amount of memory required for the storage of the image data within the graphics system would be reduced, thus requiring less physical memory to be implemented or allocated within said graphics system for the storage of said image data, while at the same time said incorporation would utilize conventional graphic techniques, such as a Z-buffer, which would not require specialized hardware to be implemented.

Foley et al. teaches a viewing means by which rendered (drawn) objects are viewed dependent on a given perspective projection, wherein the presented view of said objects change in accordance with the change of said perspective projection. The visual effect of said perspective projection is similar to that of photographic (camera) systems (p. 230-236, § 6.1). Foley et al. also teaches a synthetic camera (p. 299-302, § 7.3.4).

6. In regard to claim 2 the rationale disclosed in the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein (p. 610-611, §14.3.4; p. 727-728, §16.1.3; p. 1044-1046, §20.8.2). It is noted that the interpolation between said primitive color and said user-specified depth-cue color is considered to yield a spectrum of colors, wherein said spectrum of colors is a combination of said primitive color and said user-specified depth-cue color.



***Response to Amendment***

15. The prior 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection has been withdrawn in lieu of Applicant's remarks. The Applicant is directed to the Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility. It is noted that "drawing" is not considered to read on displaying (e.g. a tangible result), as information can be drawn (e.g. rendered) to a frame buffer for display but not actually displayed. If the Applicant has any questions in regard to the new 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection the Applicant is invited to contact the examiner.

16. In response to Applicant's remarks that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (e.g. performing unique alpha value processing and depth cueing processing with respect to only distance objects) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

17. In response to Applicant's remarks that the prior art of record fails to teach "...within a depth cueing area, which is set near the backward clipping plane of the viewing volume based on a position of the viewpoint..." the Applicant is directed to the respective rejection above, which has been clarified to address the new limitations. Specifically, Foley et al. illustrates a depth cueing area in Color Plate II.24 and Color Plate II.25. It is noted that the respective claim language includes open-ended language (i.e. comprising). Thus, said claim is not considered read on the depth cueing

Art Unit: 2628

7. In regard to claim 10 the rationale disclosed in the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein.

8. In regard to claim 11 Foley et al. teaches that the graphics system is thus an intermediary between the application program and the display hardware (p. 17-19, § 1.6.1-1.6.2). The rationale disclosed in the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein.

9. In regard to claim 12 the rationale disclosed in the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein.

10. In regard to claim 20 Foley et al. teaches that the graphics system is thus an intermediary between the application program and the display hardware (p. 17-19, § 1.6.1-1.6.2). The rationale disclosed in the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein.

11. In regard to claim 21 the rationale disclosed in the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein. It is noted said system is considered to perform the method.

12. In regard to claim 22 the rationale disclosed in the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated herein.

13. In regard to claim 27 the rationale disclosed in the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein. It is noted said system is considered to perform the method.

14. In regard to claims 28-33 the rationale disclosed in the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein (Griffin – col. 32, lines 55-67; col. 33, lines 1-37; col. 37, lines 48-67; col. 38, lines 1-20). It is noted said depth values for incoming pixels are considered to read on depth cueing values and as such a respective depth value would increase/decrease as processing is performed along the z-axis accordingly.

Art Unit: 2628

area being set only near the backward clipping plane. It is implicitly taught by Foley et al. that said depth cueing area depends, at least to some degree, on a viewpoint as said scenes in Color Plate II.24 and Color Plate II.25 contain various graphical information displayed from a given viewpoint. In addition it is noted that said Color Plates are considered to comprise objects in both the background and foreground.

18. Applicant's remarks have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter-Anthony Pappas whose telephone number is 571-272-7646. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ulka Chauhan can be reached on 571-272-7782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 09/889,372  
Art Unit: 2628

Page 11

Peter-Anthony Pappas  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2628

PP

  
ULKA CHAUHAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER